

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are all of the pending claims, with claims 1, 31, 38 and 39 being independent claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 31 and 34 are amended. New claims 38-43 are added. No new matter is added.

I. Interview

A telephone interview was conducted on November 26 and November 27, 2007 with Examiner Avila and Applicants' representative. During the interview, it was agreed that the amended claims submitted herewith would be entered and examined and in the event the claims were found not to be allowable, the Examiner would issue a new non-final rejection. The Examiner's decision is based on the Examiner's reliance on foreign language reference WO 02/057132 to reject the pending claims. The Examiner indicated during the telephone interview that an English language translation has now been obtained and will be provided, if necessary, to Applicants' representative with the next Office Action.

II. Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 16-20 and 27-34 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and the intervening claims. Applicants submit that claim 1 is amended to include allowable subject matter recited in claim 4 and, therefore, claims 1-30, 36 and 37 are in condition for allowance. Applicants note that the subject matter of intervening claim 2 is not necessary to the patentability of the claims as the Examiner rejects the subject matter recited in claim 2 and the patentable subject matter of claim 4 does not require any antecedent basis in claim 2. Allowable claim 31 is also rewritten in independent form and therefore claims 31-35 are also in condition for allowance. As all of the pending claims recite allowable subject matter, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections on Prior Art Grounds:

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7-10, 13-15, 21-26 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,678,439 to Schliehthorst ("Schliehthorst") in view of WO 02/057132

(Rzadki); and claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schliehthorst and Rzadki in view of US 3,943,876 Kiekhaefer (“Kiekhaefer”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Schliehthorst and Rzadki References

As allowable claim 31 is rewritten in independent form, dependent claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

Further, neither Schliehthorst nor Rzadki, whether considered alone or in combination disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in the rejected claims. For example, claim 1 is amended to recite subject matter recited in allowable claim 4. Specifically, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest a frigate vessel-type equipment system comprising ... a propulsion segment ... wherein electric motors in the propulsion segment are designed with windings composed of a high temperature super conductor.

Schliehthorst discloses a modular engine installation for driving a propeller of a ship (col. 1, lines 6-9). Specifically, as shown in Figs. 1-7 of Schliehthorst, a rectangular module 13 includes a box frame with several longitudinal floor beams running parallel to one another. The floor beams 31 are connected by cross beams 9 and vertical beams 10 on the four corners on the rectangular modules 13. The box like module 13 may be suspended from above on a force bearing member that is firmly attached to a deck of a ship (col. 1, lines 62-65; col. 6, lines 40-45).

The foreign language reference of Rzadki only includes an English language abstract. When an abstract is used to support a rejection, the evidence relied upon is the facts maintained in the abstract, not additional facts contained in the underlying full text document. Citation of and reliance upon an abstract without citation and reliance upon the underlining scientific document is generally inappropriate. Further, if the document is in any language other than English and the Examiner seeks to rely on the document, a translation must be obtained so that the record is clear as to the precise facts the Examiner is relying upon in support of the rejection (see MPEP §706.02).

In the present instance, the Examiner has provided only an English language abstract of Rzadki and therefore reliance on any other part of the underlining document other than the

English language abstract of Rzađki is improper. Accordingly, no motivation can be claimed from the Rzađki document to modify the Schliehthorst reference.

Even were such a modification made, the combination of references still fails to render the claims obvious because the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest electrical motors in the propulsion segment designed with windings composed of a high temperature super conductor. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Schliehthorst, Rzađki and Kiekhaefer References

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of references. However, claim 6 is allowable for its dependency on independent claim 1 for the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Moreover, as Kiekhaefer fails to overcome the deficiencies of Schliehthorst and Rzađki, the combination of references fails to render claim 6 obvious.

IV. New Claims

None of the applied references, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in new claims 38-43. For example, new independent claim 38 is a combination of independent claim 1, allowable claim 11, and dependent claim 14. Thus, none of the applied references, whether considered alone or in combination disclose or suggest a frigate vessel-type equipment system, comprising a vessel hull, matched to the frigate vessel-type equipment system on a size and requirement-specific basis; and standard equipment segments including a power generator segment, a power distribution segment, a propulsion segment and an automation segment, at least one of the standard segments being formed from standard units and components arranged in accordance with the requirements in the vessel hull of the frigate vessel-type equipment system, and installable in vessel hulls of different vessel-type equipment systems, wherein the standard equipment segments are distributable across various portions of the vessel hull, and the power generator segment includes generators having windings composed of a high-temperature superconductor, and the power generator segment is distributed over a number of ship protection areas in the frigate vessel type equipment system.

Moreover, new independent claim 39 is a combination of independent claim 1 and allowable claim 16. Thus, the combination of references fails to disclosure or suggest a frigate

vessel-type equipment system, comprising a vessel hull, matched to the frigate vessel-type equipment system on a size and requirement-specific basis; and standard equipment segments including a power generator segment, a power distribution segment, a propulsion segment and an automation segment, at least one of the standard segments being formed from standard units and components arranged in accordance with the requirements in the vessel hull of the frigate vessel-type equipment system, and installable in vessel hulls of different vessel-type equipment systems, wherein the standard equipment segments are distributable across various portions of the vessel hull, the power generator segment includes a first electrical system arranged in a stern end, first ship protection area, and a second electrical system, which is subdivided into a stern-end electrical system section with two gas turbines and a bow-end electrical system section with generators, is arranged in a midships, second vessel protection area.

Finally, new claims 40-43 mirror allowable claims 17-20, respectively and depend on new independent claim 39 and therefore are allowable for the recitation of the allowable subject matter in claim 16.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant earnestly solicits reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: _____


John W. Fitzpatrick, Reg. No. 41,018

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/JWF:mat